



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SANTANGELO LAW OFFICES, P.C.
125 SOUTH HOWES, THIRD FLOOR
FORT COLLINS CO 80521

MAILED

MAR 25 2011

PCT LEGAL ADMINISTRATION

In re Application of :
George H. Tagawa, et al. : DECISION ON PETITIONS
Application No. 10/599,107 : UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) AND
Filed: September 19, 2006 : UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)
Attorney Docket No. TGI-Shifter-USNP :

This is a decision on the "REFERENCE REQUIRED BY 35 USC §120 AND 37 CFR §1.78(a)(2) TO THE PRIOR FILED APPLICATIONS" filed 09 September 2010, to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) for the benefit of the prior-filed nonprovisional and provisional applications. The paper is being treated as a petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6). Applicant has provided payment of the petition fee.

The petitions are GRANTED.

The present nonprovisional application was filed after November 29, 2000, and the claim herein for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed nonprovisional applications is submitted after expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). Therefore, this is a proper petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6).

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) and 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(i) and 1.78(a)(5)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The petition complies with the requirements for a grantable petition under 37 CFR §§1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) in that (1) a proper reference to the prior-filed applications has been included in an amendment to the first sentence of the specification, as provided by 37

CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(iii) and 1.78(a)(5)(iii); (2) the surcharge fee required by 37 CFR 1.17(t) has been submitted; and (3) the petition contains a proper statement of unintentional delay. The statement contained in the instant petition is additionally being construed as the statement required by 37 CFR 1.78 (a)(5)(iii) with respect to the late provisional claim that the entire period of delay was unintentional and petitioner must notify the Office if this is **not** a correct interpretation of the statement contained in the instant petition. Accordingly, having found that the petition for acceptance of an unintentionally delayed claim for the benefit of priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) to the prior-filed applications satisfies the conditions of 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), the petition is granted.

The granting of the petition to accept the delayed benefit claim to the prior-filed applications under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) should not be construed as meaning that this application is entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the prior-filed applications. In order for this application to be entitled to the benefit of the prior-filed applications, all other requirements under 35 U.S.C. §§120 and 365(c) and 1.78(a)(1) and (a)(2) and under 35 U.S.C. §119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(4) and (a)(5) must be met. Similarly, the fact that the corrected Filing Receipt accompanying this decision on petition includes the prior-filed applications should not be construed as meaning that applicant is entitled to the claim for benefit of priority to the prior-filed applications noted thereon. Accordingly, the examiner will, in due course, consider this benefit claim and determine whether this application is entitled to the benefit of the earlier filing date.

A corrected Filing Receipt, which includes the priority claim to the prior-filed applications, accompanies this decision on petition.

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Derek A. Putonen at (571) 272-3294. All other inquiries concerning either the examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

This matter is being referred to Technology Center Art Unit 3643 for appropriate action on the amendment submitted September 14, 2010, including consideration by the examiner of the claim for benefit of the prior-filed applications.



Boris Milef
PCT Legal Examiner
Office of PCT Legal Administration